

No. 9(1)82-8Lab/2042.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Industrial Tribunal, Faridabad, in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Chohan Industries, Hanuman Gate, Jagadhari.

BEFORE SHRI M. C. BHARDWAJ, PRESIDING OFFICER, INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 179 of 1981

*between*

SHRI JAI RAM SINGH, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S. CHOAHAN INDUSTRIES, HANUMAN GATE, JAGADHARI.

*Present.—*

Shri Surinder Kumar, for the workman.

None, for the management.

AWARD

By order No. ID/YMN/70/81/29226, dated 10th June, 1981, the Governor of Haryana referred the following dispute between the management of M/s Chohan Industries, Hanuman Gate, Jagadhari, and its workman Shri Jai Ram Singh, to this tribunal, for adjudication, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act.

Whether the termination of services of Shri Jai Ram Singh, was justified and in order ? If so, to what relief is he entitled ?

On receipt of the order of reference notices were issued to the parties. The management refused to take the summons. The management was proceeded against *ex parte* and the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the workman. The workman in his *ex parte* evidence stated that he worked with the management for one year as a Buffman. The management terminated his services on 2nd March, 1981 without assigning any reason. His salary was Rs. 900 P.M.

Believing *ex parte* statement of the workman, I give my award that the termination of services of the workman was neither justified, nor in order. The workman is entitled to reinstatement with continuity of service and with full backwages.

Dated the 11th February, 1982.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 171, dated the 16th February, 1982.

Forwarded (four copies), to the Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947.

M. C. BHARDWAJ,  
Presiding Officer,  
Industrial Tribunal, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

The 18th March, 1982

No. 9 (1) 82-8Lab/1996.—In pursuance of the provisions of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947) the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Veer Woollen Industries Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER  
LABOUR COURT, HARYANA FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 238 of 1981

*between*

SHRI RAM SINGH WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S VEER WOOLLEN INDUSTRIES, PANIPAT

*Present.—*

Workman in person with Shri Reghbubir Singh.

Shri S. Kaushal, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 238 of 1981 has been referred to this court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/KNL/74/81/45903, dated 8th September, 1981 under section 10(i)(c) of the Industrial disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Ram Singh workman and the management of M/s Veer Woollen Industries, Panipat. The terms of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Ram Singh was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties for 7th October, 1981 at Panipat. The parties appeared and filed their pleadings. On the pleadings of the parties, issues were framed on 16th November, 1981. On 15th December, 1981 when the case was fixed for the evidence of the management, the representative of management made a statement in this Court that the management has agreed to pay the fifteen days wages to the workman in full and final settlement of his all claims or dispute including the right of re-instatement or re-employment. He further stated that after the payment of fifteen days wages there is no dispute between the parties. This statement was duly admitted by the workman. He further stated that he does not want to pursue his case and withdrawn the same. In view of the above statement of the parties, I hold that there is no dispute between the parties. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

The 17th February, 1982

Presiding officer,  
Labour Court Haryana, Faridabad.

Endorsement No. 474, dated the 19th February, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Govt. Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh as required under section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947. with the request that the receipt of the above said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1)82-8Lab/1997.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s. R.B. Metal Works, Kalyan Nagar, Jagadhri.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD

Reference No. 163 of 1980 (Fbd. 368/1981)

*between*

SHRI BHAGWAT PARSHAD WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S R. B.  
METAL WORKS, KALYAN NAGAR, JAGADHRI.

Shri Rajeshwar Nath, for the workman.

Shri Subhash Chand, for the management.

## AWARD

This reference No. 163 of 1980 has been referred to the Labour Court, Rohtak by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/YMN/124-80/35086, dated 1st July, 1980, under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Bhagwat Parshad workman and the management of M/s R. B. Metal Works, Kalyan Nagar, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of service of Shri Bhagwat Parshad was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties by the Labour Court, Rohtak for 29th October, 1980. The parties appeared and the case was fixed for settlement. Seven adjournment had already been given to the Parties by the Labour Court, Rohtak. Then the Haryana Government transferred this case to this court,—*vide* order No. 1 (79)-80-1-Lab., dated 27th October, 1980. And this case was received in this Court in December, 1981 in reference No. Fbd. 368/1981.

After receiving this case file, notices were sent to the parties for 11th January, 1982 at Yamuna Nagar. On that day both the parties appeared and the case was fixed for 10th February, 1982 at Yamuna Nagar for settlement. On 10th February, 1982 the representative of the workman made a statement in this Court that the workman had settled his case with the management mutually. So he does not want to pursue his case and withdrawn the same. This statement was duly admitted by the representative of the management. In view of the above statement of the parties, I hold that there is no dispute between the parties. No order as to costs.

Dated the 17th February, 1982

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK.

Presiding Officer  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 475, dated the 19th February, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour and Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above said award may Please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9(1) 82-8Lab/2002/I.—In pursuance of the provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workman and the management of M/s Mittal Weaving Factory, Panipat.

IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD.

Reference No. 124 of 1981

*between*

SHRIMATI DEVI BAI WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S MITTAL WEAVING FACTORY PANIPAT

Shri Karan Singh, for the workman.

Shri S. Kaushal, for the management.

#### AWARD

This reference No. 124 of 1981 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. 1D/KNL/31-81/13176, dated 17th March, 1981 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shrimati Devi Bai, workman and the management of M/s Mittal Weaving Factory, Panipat. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination of services of Smt. Devi Bai was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is she entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices, were sent to the Parties. The parties appeared and filed their Pleadings. The management stated in their written statement that there is no such firm in the name of Mittal Weaving Factory, Panipat. On 13th January, 1982 when the case was fixed for filing of rejoinder

and framing of issues, the representative of the workman made a statement in this court that the workman has been served upon his demand notice on the wrong management. So he does not want to pursue this case and withdrawn the same. In these circumstances, I hold that this reference is bad in law and withdrawn by the representative of the workman. So there is no dispute between the parties. I give my award accordingly. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 17th February, 1982.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

Endst. No. 481, dated 19th February, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time.

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana,  
Faridabad.

No. 9 (1)82-8Lab/2003.—In Pursuance of the Provision of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act No. XIV of 1947), the Governor of Haryana is pleased to Publish the following award of the Presiding Officer, Labour Court, Faridabad in respect of the dispute between the workmen and the management of M/S Sham Metal Industries, Gopal Nagar, Jagadhri.

**IN THE COURT OF SHRI HARI SINGH KAUSHIK, PRESIDING OFFICER, LABOUR COURT, HARYANA, FARIDABAD**

**Reference No. 240 of 1980**

*between*

**SHRI JAIHID ALI ANSARI, WORKMAN AND THE MANAGEMENT OF M/S SHAM METAL INDUSTRIES, GOPAL NAGAR, JAGADHRI.**

Shri Surinder Kumar, for the workman.

None, for the management.

**AWARD**

This reference No. 240 of 1980 has been referred to this Court by the Hon'ble Governor of Haryana,—*vide* his order No. ID/YMN/77-80/22932, dated the 5th May, 1980 under section 10 (i) (c) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 for adjudication of the dispute existing between Shri Jaihid Ali Ansari workman and the management of M/S Sham Metal Industries, Gopal Nagar, Jagadhri. The term of the reference was:—

Whether the termination or service of Shri Jaihid Ali Ansari was justified and in order? If not, to what relief is he entitled?

After receiving this reference, notices were sent to the parties. The Regd. A.D. notice which was sent to the management received back with the postal authorities remarks 'Refused'. On the other hand the representative of the workman was present on 21st July, 1981 at Ambala Cantt. But none was present on behalf of the management. It was already 12.45 P.M. The case was called thrice and the *ex parte* proceedings was held against the management. Then the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the workman for 21st August, 1981 at Yamuna Nagar. After that seven opportunities had already been given to the workman for his *ex parte* evidence but he failed. On 10th February, 1982 when the case was fixed for the *ex parte* evidence of the workman at Yamuna Nagar. Neither the workman nor his representative was present. It was already 2.35 P.M. The case was called thrice. In these circumstances, I feel that the workman is not interested to pursue his case. So I hold that the reference is bad in law and the case is dismissed in default of the parties. No orders as to costs.

Dated the 17th February, 1982

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,  
Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court, Haryana, Faridabad.

Endst. No. 482, dated 19th February, 1982

Forwarded (four copies) to the Commissioner & Secretary to Government, Haryana, Labour & Employment Departments, Chandigarh, as required under Section 15 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 with the request that the receipt of the above-said award may please be acknowledged within week's time:

HARI SINGH KAUSHIK,

Presiding Officer,  
Labour Court Haryana,  
Faridabad.